DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 771 AC 012 754

TITLE	Highlights of the National Workshop for Community Resource Development Leaders.
INSTITUTION	Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. Extension Service.
PUB DATE	Jun 71
NOTE	19p.; Workshop held in Washington, D.C. (March 9-11, 1971)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Development; *Community Resources; Conferences; Group Discussion; *Leadership; Professional Personnel; *Rural Development; *Workshops

ABSTRACT

The first National Workshop for Community Resource Development Leaders was held in Washington, D.C., March 9-11, 1971. This report on the conference highlights the presentations of four speakers: (1) "The Road Ahead in Rural Development," by Henry L. Ahlgrens; (2) "Extension Emphasis in Rural Development," by Edwin L. Kirby; (3) "Summary of Group Discussions," by H.A. Wadsworth; and (4) "Challenges in Rural Development," by C.R. Harrington. (Author/CK)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AGR AC

For Administrative Use)

ED 065771

HIGHLIGHTS of the NATIONAL WORKSHOP for COMMUNITY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT LEADERS

Held in

Washington, D. C.

March 1971

AC 012 754

Extension Service

U.S. Department of Agriculture

June 1971

PREFACE

The first National Workshop for Community Resource Development Leaders was held in Washington, D.C., March 9-11, 1971. Eighty-eight CRD leaders and specialists from all but six States attended. Besides group discussions, the participants heard:

1. Speakers from several branches of government on national commitments to CRD and new programs in the offing.

2. Speakers representing various parts of the Cooperative Extension Service.

This report highlights the presentations of four speakers:

"The Road Ahead in Rural Development" by Henry L. Ahlgren, Deputy Under Secretary of Agriculture for Rural Development.

"Extension Emphasis in Rural Development" by Edwin L. Kirby, Administrator, Extension Service, USDA.

"Summary of Group Discussions" by H.A. Wadsworth, Purdue University.

"Challenges in Rural Development" by C.R. Harrington, Associate Director of Extension, New York and Chairman of the ECOP Subcommittee on Community Resource Development and Public Affairs.

Participants at the opening session of the National Workshop for Community Resource Development Leaders, held in Washington, D.C., March 9-11, 1971.

The Road Ahead
In Rural Development

Henry L. Ahlgren
Deputy Under Secretary of Agriculture for Rural Development

In order to know something about the road ahead, it is sometimes to our benefit to look back over the road already traveled.

Development of the USDA

The U.S. Department of Agriculture was set up in 1862, the same year the Homestead Act was passed. The new USDA offered leadership in stimulating the Nation's agricultural development by establishing a national executive office to assist the agricultural industry.

USDA focused its early efforts on the farm family -- the farmer, the homemaker, farm youth. It helped develop the greatest agriculture the world has ever known.

Many functions and agencies for specific purposes have been added to the Department since its beginning. In 1954, True Morse, an Under Secretary of Agriculture in the Eisenhower administration, spoke of Rural Development. Over the years, different phrases have been used to describe this concept -- Rural Areas Development, Rural Development, Community Resource Development and other variations.

Extension's Scope Report of 1958 and the Report of the Joint USDA-NASULGC (National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges) Study Committee on Cooperative Extension, "A People and a Spirit," both set forth goals for Rural Development. The Rural Development effort has also been expanded, as the USDA has reached out to other departments of government, seeking support and assistance.

Now we have President Nixon proposing reorganization of the executive branch of government into functional areas -- the departments of Human Resources, Natural Resources, Community Development and Economic Affairs. And that's good.

Development of the Land Grant Universities

The Land Grant Universities and their colleges of agriculture have developed concurrently with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The Civil War year of 1862 saw the third event of significance to Rural Development -- it was in that year that the Land Grant College (Morrill) Act was passed into law by Congress. Later came the Hatch Act of 1867, which established the Experiment Stations at our Land Grant Universities and the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, which funded Cooperative Extension Services in all the States.

At first the Land Grant Colleges had only production-oriented departments of research, teaching and Extension in their colleges of agriculture. More recently, social science courses and departments have been established, such as rural sociology and agricultural economics.

Recently many agricultural Extension Services have been merged into university-wide Extension services -- to serve all people, not just farm people. And the Land Grant Colleges and Universities have changed their names to reflect their broader educational roles. There were once many A&M and A&T colleges. Today there are only a handful. Most have changed from A&M and A&T colleges to State universities

Why Rural Development Has Failed

To spend a little more time on the road we have traveled, I want to make a categorical statement about Rural Development. It has essentially failed to this point. There have been isolated, sporadic instances of success, it's true. But the great goals of Rural Development have not been achieved. The effort has not been sustained.

Why not? First, because its time had not come.

Next, because we have attempted to build our concept of Rural Development on too narrow a base. In fact, the greatest flurries of activity have merely involved the wasteful jockeying between agencies within this Department and now between departments to see who is going to "take over" Rural Development -- who will get to claim the effort for his own. Rural Development is a process -- a strategy. It is not a program. Until we accept that, our efforts will continue to fail.

The third reason why Rural Development efforts have essentially failed is our inability to involve the people that Rural Development is supposed to serve. Our rural areas will not reach any high degree of development unless and until local people want development. The Rural Development strategy will succeed only if local leaders aggressively move it forward.

The Time Has Come

Now, however, the time for Rural Development has arrived. The National Goals Research Staff of the White House in its July 4, 1970, report recognized the need for a national policy on balanced growth. The last Census showed that 73 percent of our people live in urban areas on 2 to 3 percent of our land area. The trend is for more and more people to live in fewer and fewer large places, on the East Coast from Northern Virginia to Maine, on the West Coast from San Diego to San Francisco, in the Midwest from Milwaukee and Chicago to Pittsburgh and on the Florida peninsula.

The indications are that if these trends continue, our Nation is on a collision course with disaster. Our great megalopolises, if left to grow unchecked, will become politically unmanageable, socially intolerable and economically inefficient. Pollution problems, transportation paralysis, housing blight, increasing crime and crowding will accelerate. Peter Halpern of the National Goals staff speaks of a "congested megalopolis -- where we would be choked by traffic, suffocated by smog, deafened by noise, terrorized by crime."

What's Been Happening in Government

What has been happening in government that leads me to say that the time for Rural Development has come? Besides proposing to reorganize departments of government on a functional basis, President Nixon has created an Urban Affairs Council and a Rural Affairs Council, now combined into a Domestic Affairs Council. Within the Domestic Council is a Committee on Rural Development. The President appointed a Task Force on Rural Development which has issued its report -- "A New Life for the Country." He has directed all cabinet level officials to cooperate in making their expertise and resources available for Rural Development.

In Memorandum 1667 of November 1969, the Secretary of Agriculture established a departmental Rural Development Committee. He directed each State to form a Rural Development Committee made up of representatives from the Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, Forest Service, Farmers Home Administration and Rural Electrification Administration specifically and such other Federal and State government representatives as each council might wish to involve. Counties and/or areas were also encouraged to form Rural Development Committees with local USDA representative members and citizen advisory committees.

The Agricultural Act of 1970 included a section on Rural Development -- Title IX. In it, the Congress commits itself to Rural Development and a "sound balance between rural and urban America."

Interest in and support of Rural Development in executive and legislative branches is running high. I have visited several States since coming to Washington late in 1970. The interest in Rural Development has been great in every State I have visited.

A final indication of increasing interest in and attention to Rural Development is the new program of Rural Community Development through revenue sharing which the President has proposed to Congress. One of the President's six special revenue sharing proposals, it would be a $1.1 billion program, including all the educational programs of the Cooperative Extension Service.

Rural America Today

There are 65 million people living in rural areas today. Here I speak of all areas outside of metropolitan areas -- that is, those areas which do not contain a city of 50,000 persons or more. These 65 million, though they occupy almost 98 percent of the land area, are still too many for the opportunities available to them. There is not enough business and industry, not enough jobs and investment. Rural America has more than its share of poor housing and low incomes. In many areas, the amenities of life are starkly deficient.

But rural America has great potential. It contains our farms -- 2,800,000 of them -- the finest farms in the world. They provide our national food supply. The farms must be the core and the key to successful rural development.

Rural America also has our forests, minerals and fossil fuels; our beautiful lakes, rivers and streams; our abundant fish and wildlife; our precious open space, with its elbow room, beauty and tranquility and its capacity for inspiration and self-renewal; it offers our recreational and play areas.

To Get the Job Done

A national policy on balanced growth, which will include a policy on Rural Development, must be heavily weighted in economic terms. We will have to create the jobs and incomes in rural America to make it grow and prosper. But it will mean much more -- greater efforts -- to improve all of these things: sewer and water facilities, education, health services, recreational and cultural opportunities, tax incentives, wise land use planning, efficient transportation networks, clean water and air, satisfactory employment, rising per capita incomes and an egalitarian distribution of government goods and services.

The people are ready -- now. We are one Nation. We must help our people find the best course of action through Rural Development.

Extension Emphasis In Rural Development

Edwin L. Kirby, Administrator,
Extension Service, USDA

The Cooperative Extension Service has a very positive favorable climate in which it can move forward in more adequately fulfilling its educational and organizational leadership role in rural development. There is broad-based support for rural development as evidenced by the President, by Congress, by the Department and by the Extension staff at national, State, and local levels. There should be no doubt about the importance of this effort as we see added emphasis being given to it as well as added demands for this assistance.

Major Responsibilities

State Extension Services through your directors and ECOP have readily accepted seven major responsibilities for improving rural America. These are:

1. Develop education programs that will stimulate and assist leaders to understand and apply the community development process.

2. Assist individuals and development groups in securing and utilizing available local, State, and national government resources.

3. Cooperate with other agencies in maintaining effective USDA Rural Development Committees.

4. Utilize and extend appropriate university competencies.

5. Provide in-service training on rural development to Extension and others.

6. Conduct innovative rural development projects.

7. Assist in multi-county planning and development.

Progress

Reported progress in these responsibilities is most encouraging. We have placed major emphasis on assisting leaders at local, area, and State levels to more fully understand and apply the community development process, including the identification and utilization of private and public resources available.

Based on recent reports from States, Extension has helped to organize and assist some 5,220 citizen committees in this process. These consist of about 3,800 community committees, 1,300 county, 110 area and 20 State citizen committees. Also, Extension has assisted with organizing, maintaining and servicing some 2,600 agency committees at county, area and State levels. The organization and servicing of some 7,800 agency and citizen committees reflect a substantial accomplishment for Extension.

Another major accomplishment has been the training provided to both professional staff and to citizen committees and groups. If we expect staff members to make a major contribution to rural development, they must have the necessary subject matter expertise and competence to work effectively with groups. Recent reports from States indicate the following training specific to rural development:

1. Rural Development in-service training conducted by Extension for Extension workers -- 280 sessions. Extension training in rural development conducted for citizen groups -- 3,370 sessions. Twenty-two States have conducted training for USDA members of Rural Development committees.

2. Community Resource Development publications -- 346.

In addition, States reported 368 CRD applied research projects or studies underway or completed and 3,565 CRD radio and TV broadcasts. As State Leaders, Extension Directors look to you to see that such training opportunities are provided for Extension staffs within the States as well as consideration for needed training opportunities for staff of other agencies when called upon to assist.

Expanded Efforts

If Extension is to fulfill its responsibilities for the revitalization of rural America, we need to continue and expand our efforts in the following areas:

1. Expanded training effort. Within ES, we are giving strong support to National and Regional CRD workshops.

   a. The Southern region has recently completed an excellent workshop with over 100 attending.

   b. The Western region has a two-week workshop scheduled for June.

   c. The Northeast region is developing training teams to go to the individual States to assist with training program aides.

   d. The North Central region has proposed a workshop for April 1972.

These will meet some of the needs of the State and area staff but additional training at the State level is also a must.

2. We need to stress the importance of task forces and gaining access to the total resources of the university.

3. We must stress the importance of helping the staff develop professionalism as it works with the top leaders of the county, area, and State.

4. RD Committees have an opportunity to play an important role in development. You may be able to help the committee define its specific roles and carry them out.

5. Regional workshops for the USDA agency representatives on the State RD Committees are being planned for May.

Extension's Role

We must keep our role in perspective and remember that we are only one part of the broad Rural Development effort. You heard many of the other parts of this effort discussed this

week, but we have the major responsibility for education and we can play an important role in facilitating and supporting other's efforts. This is especially true for working with State governments and district planning.

John Miller, left, chats with Edwin L. Kirby at the first National Workshop for CRD Leaders. Miller is Director of Extension, Washington State and adviser to the ECOP Subcommittee on Community Resource Development and Public Affairs. Kirby is Administrator, Extension Service, USDA.

Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin addresses the participants at the first National Workshop for Community Resource Development.

Summary
Of Group Discussions

H. A. Wadsworth, Assistant Head,
Extension, Department of Agricultural Economics
and
Program Director of Community Development, Purdue
University

This summary represents an attempt on my part to compile the reports received from the various discussion groups. I have attempted to prepare this abstract in order to respond to the questions posed by Director Miller in his comments opening the conference. Hopefully, this response reflects experiences and knowledge of State leaders in Community Development which will prove helpful to the Community Resource Development and Public Affairs Subcommittee of ECOP. It is from this base that we will evaluate changes in program to develop effective Extension education in Community Development in the States.

What Are We About?

It should be recognized at the outset that "local community developers" are in every community. They make decisions about community problems and will continue to do so, with or without our assistance. Our job is to help the "local community developers" in their continual struggle to achieve a better combination of jobs, income, community facilities, and services with the resources at their disposal. More precisely, "the community developers," who must start where the community is, need to understand and be able to compare possible alternatives in terms of the community's values before making a decision. Our job is not to build houses, sewer systems and solid waste disposal systems, establish vocational training opportunities, medical services, etc. Our job is to provide educational experiences and information so that such decisions can be made with more assurance than ever before.

Whom Do We Work With?

As with other Extension education programs, it is necessary to focus clearly on our students or clientele. There seem to be about two general groups with whom we might work.

The first of these is a composite of lay leaders and public officials who can make decisions and secure legitimization for action. Most of these people are interested in community problems and some have official responsibility for resolving them. However, this group is not what one might consider a natural group in that they rarely meet together for extended discussions of particular problems. In addition to its educational work, Extension can help organize these people into a group in order to facilitate understanding and decision making on possible alternatives to community problems.

The second group is a composite of persons representing legal entities and existing organizations interested in solving a particular problem, such as solid waste disposal, medical care, vocational training, etc. The common nature of the problem provides group cohesiveness. Divergent views about solutions generally mean that additional information and analysis is necessary before a solution can be reached.

While we probably think that the general public is our ultimate clientele, we would tend to work with the above two generalized groups in reaching them. It is extremely difficult to work with the general public in Community Development and we probably will do so only when necessary to create awareness about a particular problem. It is essentially impossible to conduct a Community Development education program with the general public that is more than dissemination of information. We must develop understanding for community decision making with smaller groups.

What Is Cooperative Extension Service's Contribution?

Certainly the Cooperative Extension Service's role is distinctly educational. This means that our function is to help "local community developers" know, first, what their alternatives are and, secondly, how to analyze the consequences of the possible choices facing them. By building the knowledge and the analytical base of these "community developers," we have laid the groundwork for deliberate, planned, meaningful decision making at the community level.

Once decisions have been made, the Cooperative Extension Service may need to help local people initiate appropriate action. Extension can provide education on how to get things done, particularly in how to organize and how to obtain technical assistance to achieve the desired results. Extension may simply bring together the local people with appropriate government or private agencies and groups which can provide the necessary resources to accomplish the desired end.

It is not for Extension to advocate a particular course of action with respect to a problem. This distinguishes Community Development Extension education from much of that carried on by the rest of our Extension colleagues, who must frequently make specific recommendations to the individuals with whom they work.

What Are Effective Structural Arrangements?

The structural arrangements most effective for cooperation between Extension personnel, other Federal, State, or local agencies, and parts of our universities, will depend upon the situations in the various States. At present, there are too many variations in each State for any one particular organizational structure to encompass the diversity of institutional arrangements which have evolved within each of the States. Even within the States, we should expect to find differences in organizational structure because of local and regionalized differences in problems, in interested and involved organizations, in the structure of State and local governments, special districts, ethnic and religious groups, etc.

Where Do We Go From Here?

The questions that have been considered up to now are vitally important in the development of an Extension educational program. However, they are really of a second order of priority. By this I mean that answers to these questions are "good" only in relation to how effective our answers are in achieving solutions to the problems of people. It is extremely difficult to evaluate our answers to the previous questions without some field experience which would indicate their effectiveness. The burden is on us, individually and collectively, to show the linkage that exists between our educational

efforts and the tangible resolutions to local community problems. As Administrator Kirby pointed out, our educational efforts will have to be related to jobs, income, and quality of life.

Important Dimensions

It would seem that the Community Resource Development and Public Affairs Subcommittee of ECOP could best assist the Community Development Extension education programs in our States by indicating the following important dimensions of such a program to the members of ECOP:

1. The administrative staff of the State Cooperative Extension Service must make clear and deliberate commitments to the Community Development effort. While this has been done in some States, other States have been hesitant to pay more than lip service to this effort.

2. If a Community Development Extension educational program is to succeed, the State Community Development leader and his staff must have deep and active involvement with the "local community developers." They must understand the problems of the community, the value systems within which solutions can be structured, and limits imposed by resources available in that community. A successful program cannot be run from the State Cooperative Extension Service office or from the campus of the land grant university.

3. Each State needs to develop a long-range game plan which specifies the staffing, students or clientele, resources and training programs as components of the total educational plan. While professional training programs will help, time is so short that field experience and inservice training will provide the bulk of the training. The development of evaluation procedures, which permit us to judge the "goodness" of action resulting from education, is of prime importance. The Community Resource Development and Public Affairs Subcommittee should actively encourage and support development of an evaluation procedure that would permit us to more accurately identify and evaluate the linkages between education and action.

I personally have listened to the discussions of the last two days with great interest. I am impressed with the programs that are now underway, but I am also impressed that there are great community needs for which Extension educational

programs have not been developed or for which approaches have been quite fragmentary. I am impressed that the areas of conflict between agencies are exceedingly small compared to the opportunities which are not part of any agency's program. If the Cooperative Extension Services in the various States see these problems as important, and if they are not working on them, it is evident that they have not yet responded to the opportunity afforded them. If we fail to respond to the needs of people on important problems, we cannot and probably should not expect support for existing or additional resources to conduct Extension education in Community Development.

John S. Bottum, Assistant Administrator for Rural Development, ES, USDA, convenes the first National workshop for Community Resource Development Leaders, held in Washington, D.C., March 9-11, 1971.

(Below) The Community Resource Development Staff of Extension Service, USDA, meets to discuss ideas emerging from the National Workshop. From left to right, they are: Earl F. Pettyjohn, Community Organization; William V. Neely, Public Affairs and Business Management Education; Karl F. Munson, Recreation; Dorris W. Rivers, Deputy Assistant Administrator; Frank D. Pollard, Housing and Community Facilities; C. B. Gilliland, Manpower Development; John R. Ferstrom, Economic Development; Donald L. Nelson, Information and John S. Bottum, Assistant Administrator.

Challenges
In Rural Development

C. R. Harrington, Associate Director of
Extension, New York

This is a report by the ECOP Subcommittee on Community Resource Development and Public Affairs. The other members of the subcommittee are George Abshier, Oklahoma; John Dunbar, Indiana; Gene McMurtry, Virginia; John Miller, Washington State and John Bottum, Extension Service, USDA.

ECOP, the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy, is an official body of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. It consists of three Directors of Extension from each of the four regions of the country, named by their fellow directors in the region. The Administrator of the Extension Service, USDA is also a member.

ECOP addresses itself to legislative matters pertaining to Extension, to broad policies, to organizational matters, to relationships with a variety of organizations and agencies and to programs generally. It represents Cooperative Extension interests in the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. Several subcommittees function under the general direction of ECOP. Each committee has one representative from ECOP but the other members come from the Cooperative Extension staffs in the States. One of the subcommittees is a Community Resource Development and Public Affairs subcommittee.

Roles and Responsibilities

This subcommittee has identified three basic kinds of roles and responsibilities: (1) To review the general situation relating to this program area and to recommend to ECOP specific policies, procedures, organization and activities. For example, this subcommittee recommended to ECOP that this particular workshop be approved and held. (2) To arrange for the preparation of some basic supporting materials through special task forces. You have a copy of the task force report on community resource development; you have received a copy of the report on public affairs education and you will be receiving still another task force report on curriculum and training. (3) To advise the Community Resource

Development section of the Extension Service, USDA. This subcommittee attempts to work very closely with John Bottum and his staff.

In keeping with these roles and responsibilities, the subcommittee during the past year has addressed itself to such diverse subjects as the goals of community development, some guidelines for using additional Federal funds when and if they are received, staff development and a plan for continuing in-service education and meaningful programs of State rural development committees. The subcommittee believes that Extension is appropriately involved in community resource development. We do not have all of the commitment and all of the resources that many of us would like to have, but progress is being made. Furthermore, this subcommittee believes that involvement of Extension in community resource development work is consistent with the mission of Cooperative Extension and of the land grant university. Prior to this workshop, the subcommittee had identified some tasks that could be pursued more completely:

1. Clarification of the goals of community development and thus of Extension goals and approaches. The subcommittee is now proceeding on the basis of definitions and concepts presented in the task force reports that you have received and that have already been identified.

2. Determination of possible means of tapping other university resources in support of this work.

3. Identification of specific programs and activities that work and the distribution of these program ideas to the States.

4. Identification of an approach to staffing and to obtaining local support.

5. The development of a meaningful reporting and publicizing system.

6. The determination of guidelines for the allocation of any special needs funds.

7. The determination of a strategy of obtaining additional Federal funds in support of this work.

8. The continuation of the review of organization and programs of rural development committees and the development of suggestions for improvement.

You, individually and as groups, constitute a principal source of intelligence for the Extension Service, USDA and the ECOP subcommittee concerning the condition of Extension work in this arena. Henry Wadsworth's report of your discussions provides us with much of this current intelligence but we need your continued expressions of concerns, questions and ideas. Since four regional community resource development committees are now in existence, we would seem to have the system for building this intelligence and for identifying the most significant needs and opportunities.

Challenges

Let me end this brief report by identifying a few of the challenges for all of us, including the ECOP subcommittee:

1. To be productive, consistent with the nature of Cooperative Extension, the expectations of Extension and the opportunities within community resource development work.

2. To recognize in all of this work the place of Cooperative Extension in the total arena.

3. To agree on concepts, leaving specifics to local determination.

4. To develop the strategy for obtaining a "critical mass" and organizing it.

5. To recognize the indistinct lines between Extension, research and action in this total arena.

6. To quit arguing over process versus content; it is both.

7. To determine how to publicize Extension's efforts without destroying relationships.

8. To recognize a total role that is larger than being a pipeline for Federal programs.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult Education
AUG 14 1972